Appl. No. 10/826,782

Amdt. dated April 4, 2007

Reply to Office action of March 8, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are presently pending in the application as set forth in the Preliminary

Amendment filed August 13, 2004.

In this amendment,

Claim 1 is amended

Claim 20 was added.

No claims have been canceled

Claims 2-19 remain unaltered.

Applicants note that amendments were made to the specification. The amendments

to the specification correct grammatical and typographical errors. These amendments do

not add new matter to the application.

In the present action, the Examiner entered a restriction requirement as follows:

Claims 1-12 drawn to a retaining wall in Class 182, Subclass 113; Group I

Claims 13-19 drawn to an attachment assembly in class 182, Group II

subclass 230

Initially, Applicant notes that new Claim 20 was added. New Claim 20 is a

combination of Claims 1, 13, 15 and 16. Applicant further notes that Claims 15 and 16 are

substantially identical to Claims 8 and 9, respectively. That is, Claim 20 provides for the

retaining wall fall protection system of Claim 1, but which includes the attachment

assembly of Claim 13 and as further defined in Claims 15 and 16 (or 8 and 9). In view of

the fact that Claim 20 incorporates, verbatim, the attachment assembly of Claim 13 and as

- 14 -

Appl. No. 10/826,782

Amdt. dated April 4, 2007

Reply to Office action of March 8, 2007

defined in Claims 15 and 16, Applicant respectfully asserts that new Claim 20 properly

belongs in Group II.

Applicant additionally notes that Claim 1 has been amended to change "attachment

mechanism" to "attachment assembly" so that the language of Claim 1 is consistent with

the rest of the claims.

Initially, Applicant notes that Claims 1-12 are directed to a "retaining wall fall

protection system" as set forth in the preamble of Claims 1-12, rather than a retaining wall.

However, as best understood by Applicant's this will not affect the classification noted

above by the Examiner of Claims 1-12.

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction. In particular, Claims 6 and 8-12 are

substantially identical in language to Claims 14-19. Claim 6 depends directly from Claim 1

and Claims 8-12 all depend from Claim 6. Claim 7 also depends from Claim 6. The

subject matter of Claim 7 is incorporated in Claim 13. Thus, Claims 6-121 are directed to

a retaining wall fall protection system comprising an attachment assembly as set forth in

Claim 13. Hence, the subject matter of Claim 6 would be classified in the same class and

subclass as Claim 13; the Examiner would not be required to conduct additional searches

to Examine Claims 6-12 along with Claims 13-20. Therefor, Applicant requests that the

Examiner redraw the restriction requirement to include Claims 6-12 in Group II.

In response to the Examiner's restriction requirement, Applicant elects Group II.

Should the Examiner redraw the restriction requirement as requested, then Group II would

include Claims 6-20. Otherwise Group II includes Claims 13-20.

- 15 -

Appl. No. 10/826,782

Amdt. dated April 4, 2007

Reply to Office action of March 8, 2007

Further, the Examiner entered a species/subspecies restriction between the

embodiments of the attachment device retainer shown in FIGS. 17 and 20. Applicant notes

that at least Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20 read on the species

of FIG. 17; that at least Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19 and 20 read on the

species of FIG. 20; and that at least Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20 are generic to

both species. Applicant further notes that Claims 2-7 are directed to aspects of the fall

protection system, and that the attachment assembly of either FIG. 17 or FIG. 20 could be

used with the fall protection system set forth in Claims 2-6. Hence, Claims 2-5 are also

deemed to be generic with respect to both species.

In response to the species/subspecies restriction, Applicant elects to proceed with

the attachment assembly retainer of FIG. 17 (Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16,

17, 18 and 20).

You are hereby authorized to charge payment of an extension fee associated with

this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 162201.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: April 4, 2007

/jonathan p. soifer, reg. no. 34,932/

Jonathan P. Soifer, Reg. No. 34,932

Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.

12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200

St. Louis, Missouri 63131

Tel: (314) 238-2400 Fax: (314) 238-2401

e-mail: Jsoifer@patpro.com

- 16 -